

Spring 2003-Academic Senate Meetings: Agendas & Minutes

April 11
March 7
February 7

Agenda: Academic Senate Meeting

April 11, 2003
Lecture Center 102

1. Reading and approval of minutes (March 7, 2003)
2. Announcements
3. Report of the Interim President
Questions and action items from the floor.
4. Report of the Presiding Officer
Questions and action items from the floor.
5. Unfinished Business.
6. New Business.
7. Adjournment.

Added item: Glenn Geher, Chairman of the Academic Affairs Committee will present Academic Calendar proposals.

Minutes: SUNY New Paltz Academic Senate Meeting

March 7, 2003

Attendance: Anne Balant (Communication Disorders) Peter Brown (Foreign Languages) Mark Dziuba (Music) Wilma Feliciano (Foreign Languages) Matt Geller (Student Representative) Glenn Geher (Psychology) Mary Hafeli (Art Education) Barbara Hardgrave (Music) Susan Kraat (Library) David Labiosa (Foreign Languages) David Lavalley (Academic Affairs) Shuang Liu (Institutional Research) Glenn McNitt (Political Science) Kelli Parmley (Institutional Research) Steven Poskanzer (President) Marda Reid (Academic Affairs) Damodaran Radhakrishnan (Engineering) Rose Rudnitski (Education Administration) Nancy Schriedewind (Educational Studies) Matthew Schwartz (Student Representative) Frank Trezza (Theatre Arts) Helise Winters (Continuing Education) June Trop Zuckerman (Secondary Education)

Call to order: Barbara Hardgrave called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.

Minutes are approved from February's meeting amended with Frank Trezza in attendance for last month's meeting.

Announcements:

- Regular Faculty Meeting next Friday.
- Matt Schwartz wants to make sure SEI's are on the agenda for next week's faculty meeting.
- SUNY New Paltz is celebrating its 175th anniversary. The town of New Paltz is celebrating its 325th anniversary.
- April 25th starts New Paltz Celebration the dedication will be between 11:30-12:30.

- Saturday, April 26th Operation Clean Sweep, looking for participants. Trees will be given to anyone who attends.

Report from the Interim President:

- Attended a two day meeting in Albany and as a result has more info on the budget
- There is going to be a tuition increase. The issue is how big it is going to be.
- The \$1,200 figure in the executive budget is facing opposition by legislators it may be changed to a \$1,000 or \$800 increase.
- The dollar value of the tuition is important to us. Every \$200 decrease in that tuition figure creates a million dollar budget hole for the college.
- We need money put back in if there is a tuition increase. Legislators do not understand that if tuition is not increased that we need more revenue.
- Legislators were not very receptive to the idea of indexing tuition.
- We need to resolve tuition now so people can plan.
- Legislators are using the budget as a bargaining chip.
- Less of a receptivity on the part of the legislators to some of the structural aspects of how tuition is set in the state.
- Legislators would rather use tuition as a political chip.
- Good News: restoration in cuts to EOP. SUNY President and the SUNY Chancellor were advocating EOP's funding be restored.
- The proposal for TAP most likely will not go anywhere; the private schools are very opposed to it.
- The budget is a deeply politicized issue. Being used as a political football.
- The prospects are pretty good for the Capitol Plan being passed. The Capital stuff is one time money. This money is spent one time and then it is gone.
- If their Capital plan passes the current planning at SUNY System is that it would be allocated to campuses based on the square footage of the campus; a perverse incentive.
- Focusing on renovation of existing building as opposed to new buildings.

To Summarize the Budget:

- Situation is serious but no reason to panic.
- The budget situation in NY State is strained but comparable to other states.
- If we are going into harder budget times we go into them in reasonably good shape.
- Applications are still way up--quality of students is still good and diversity is up.
- Any chance you get say to your assembly if you scale back the tuition you must increase budget don't view it in isolation.
- Men's basketball came close to winning the championship.
- Doll House-go see it.

Questions Regarding the President's Report:

Question:

Helise Winters: Tuition increase would not necessarily go to the colleges it would go into a pot?

Answer:

I do not think so. Giving tuition to the campuses is a lynchpin of the state university budget model.

Question:

Glen Geher: Is the tuition increase equal at different schools?

Answer:

By law in NY State tuitions at SUNY have to be the same. NY State Government has steadfastly refused to change this even though some SUNYs are research universities and some are comprehensive. Grad programs may be able to be charged differently.

Question:

Glen Geher: When do we get an answer on the tuition increase?

Answer:

The amount of the tuition is clearly a bargaining chip. We have argued that we need to know so we can plan.

Barbara Hardgrave's Report:

- Resolution that was passed at the special meeting has been sent out to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees and Harry Scherr. It will be interesting to see if there is a response.

Academic Affairs Committee Report by Glen Geher:

The first item of action : GE3:

- Three proposals put fourth by Ann Minnick.
- GE3 seems somewhat more desirable to students compared to GE2.
- GE3 omits modern world and has some minor changes.
- Ann proposed a specific system for students who want to switch.
- The committee decided that students have to agree to what they decided to when accepted, this was voted for and approved.
- Proposal to remove provision from the S/U policy. Students on Academic Probation were not allowed to use the S/U. It was supported.
- Basic Algebra is a graduation requirement independent of GE requirements. The math department is trying to phase out basic algebra. The idea is to take it out as a grad requirement.

Glen McNitt moves to approve recommendations

Peter Brown seconds it

Question by Matt Schwartz: Why is there opposition from students to GE 3?

Anne Balant: It sets a precedent.

- GE 3 is coming and we are going to implement it because we think it is better. It is easier to hold people to what they agreed to when they came. Is it ethical to make a change because it is more expedient?
- GE 3 Is more accessible

Vote on three resolutions moved by Glen Geher they pass unanimously

Academic Calendar:

Traditional Holiday's

- The motion put forward is that the academic calendar should include traditional religious holidays. Strong sentiment against this motion. The majority of people did not favor including them. Arguments against including them were about logistics. It is difficult to schedule labs because of the holidays. If we are not going to include all religions is it fair? Other students felt like their holidays were not observed as much.

Suggested Academic Calendar for fall is presented by Glen Geher. It does not include the traditionally held high holy Jewish holidays. This calendar ends relatively early and includes two days off in October. The calendar presented is based on the recommendations of the committee.

Discussion Regarding Calendar:

Question by Matt Schwartz: What are the calendars of other SUNY schools? Binghamton, Stony Brook, Albany do include the holidays. SUNY in general includes these holidays.

Rose Rudnitski: Maybe we do not understand how important these holidays are to Jewish people. She is very reluctant to support a calendar that does not include the Jewish holidays. We have to be sensitive to these issues. Maybe we can ask more of the Jewish people how they feel

Glen Geher: Jews are representative on the committee.

Yom Kippur is on a weekend.

Rosh Hashanah is in the middle of a week, for faculty a day has been given to make it up.

Glen McNitt: There are at least four campuses that do not celebrate any of the Jewish holidays.

Looking to other SUNYs is important

June Zuckerman: Speaks against the calendar as an observant Jew. We do have Christian holidays embedded in this calendar. Removing the observance of a holiday that has been traditionally observed for decades is not the same thing as adding new ones. With the number of Jewish faculty and Jewish students, those days will be scheduling nightmares. Making up the days is a pie in the sky. To remove something which has been a privilege would be a wrong.

Matt Schwartz: For someone who came from a country where Jewish holidays were not practiced and to have the days removed is disheartening. We are running from the problem. If we call ourselves a diverse population why are we not embracing them?

Glen Geher: There are other holidays that these days will be asterisked that will be mentioned and are considered important. Maybe professors could not schedule exams on that day.

Maybe next time several calendars can be suggested some people can see options.

Rose Rudnitski: There are no classes on Columbus Day, to have no classes on that day and then getting rid of the Jewish holidays is a double wrong.

Glen Geher: The reason for Columbus Day is because it is in the middle, it has a mid semester quality to it. Students wanted a mid semester break, not necessarily because we think Columbus Day should be celebrated.

David Lavalley: Students cannot be discriminated against under law.

June Zuckerman: It disadvantages Jewish students who are going to be absent and miss those classes.

David Lavalley: Faculty do not have a statutory right not to work on those days even for religious reasons.

Faculty Member Statement: International Students are disadvantaged by a longer semester, tickets are more expensive close to Christmas. This calendar was chosen because it gave the most flexibility for planning the academic calendar. It allows us to end early. Good Friday is not observed on this calendar.

Matt Schwartz: I believe there is a way to set up a calendar where every holiday is appreciated.

Glen Geher is going to report the discussion back to the committee and maybe make some changes.

Move to vote

Second

Peter Brown: I like this calendar because it does not cater to any one minority and is relatively non-religious and as a public institution that is good.

Glen McNitt feels that at a State University religious holidays should not be celebrated

Vote on resolution:

Yay: 7

Nay: 8

Motion Fails.

Assessment Report by Anne Balant and Kelli Parmley

- A few points regarding assessment needs to be clarified.
- Question that kept being raised is why are we doing this?
- This is not just about doing what is right for New Paltz.
- SUNY System has some requirements for assessment.
- What we say in General Education is to do what we are already doing.
- Individual courses and faculty will not be evaluated.
- Assessment plans can be peer reviewed.
- Improvements need be reported to middle states.
- ASC recommended a campus wide advisory council because of our track record with middle states. A body with faculty and staff would show sincerity in assessment.

Motion: Resolution of the Assessment Steering Committee.

Anne Balant moves the resolution it is seconded.

Discussion:

Faculty Member: This looks like an unfounded mandate. What is the cost for assessment? Who is going to pay for this?

Rose Rudnitski: The ASC will ask for money. We cannot ask for money until we know what we need.

Anne Balant: For some departments assessment will just be documenting what they are already doing.

David Lavalley: To not assess what you are doing is expensive. Assessment has to become part of our normal routine. Some departments already have a very robust system. Many departments have capstones. The academic piece can be made non-intrusive and part of the normal course of events. There will be a start up cost.

Peter Brown commends work by the Assessment team

Poskanzer likes that this reflects our own best thinking of what is good for our institution.

Vote on resolution

Resolution passes

NO new business

Meeting adjourned at 4:50

Respectfully submitted,
Felipa Biamonte

* * * * *

Agenda: Academic Senate Meeting

March 7, 2003
Lecture Center 102

Reading and approval of minutes. (February 7, 2003)

Announcements

Report of the Interim President of the College
Questions and action items from the floor.

Report of the Presiding Officer
Questions and action items from the floor.

Action items from the Academic Senate Committees:
Academic Affairs Committee, Glenn Geher, Chair

Unfinished Business: Assessment Steering Committee,
Anne Balant and Kelli Parmley, Co-chairs

New Business

Optional reading of reports of Officers and Committees of the
College Faculty.

Adjournment.

Minutes: SUNY New Paltz Academic Senate Meeting **February 7, 2003**

Attendance: Steven Bradford (Art Department) Mary Cryer (Accounting Services) Mark Dziuba (Music) David Eaton (Enrollment Management) Gail Gallerie (President's Office) Matthew Geller (Student Representative) Mary Hafeli (Art Education) Gerald Kitzmann (Liberal Arts and Sciences) Smita Mathur (Educational Studies) Michael Muffs (Educational Administration) Kelli Parmley (Institutional Research) Steven Poskanzer (Interim President) Damodaran Radhakrishnan (Electrical and Computer Engineering) Rose Rudnitski (Elementary Education) Rafael Saavedra (Foreign Languages) Nancy Schniedewind (Educational Studies) Ray Schwarz (Student Affairs) Matthew Schwartz (Student)

Call to order: Barbara Hardgrave called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Minutes from the last meeting, November 22, 2002, were approved

Barbara Hardgrave thought it would be a good idea to circulate the minutes from last meeting's SEI discussion

Report from the President:

Budget

- We are currently in Step 2 of a two step process
 - Step 1 proposal by SUNY Board of Trustees

- Step 2 Governor submits his State Budget proposal
- Although the budget is not good - it could be worse
- We go into any bad year in decent shape. Careful planning and management combined with savings from the retirement incentive have allowed us to absorb current year reductions without negative impacts on core functions
- This year's budget balances without tricks or gimmicks
- There are 4 key elements to the Governor's proposals for SUNY:
 1. \$178 million (16%) cut in our budget. The cut is offset by a \$1,200 increase in undergraduate resident student tuition
 2. TAP program is being restructured. TAP Payments reduced to 2/3 of total award paid during period of enrollment; remaining 1/3 paid, with interest, upon graduation
 3. Elimination of EOP stipend
 4. New 5 year capital plan

Tuition

- Decrease from Trustee proposal but still a major jump
- Student Concerns and opposition understandable
- First tuition increase in 7 years
- A rational policy would have included periodic increases in tuition
- Tuition has been a "political football" used by the government
- Concern that continuing students and their families will be caught being unable to plan/absorb
- In discussing tuition, context is key. Can't view in isolation
- SUNY tuition is still going to remain one of the lowest among public universities in the North East and it can be assumed that others will increase as well
- First tuition increase in 7 years when costs of virtually everything else have been increased
- Several entering classes have been able to complete degrees without any tuition increase
- All incomes (up to 25k) or most (up to 49k) covered by TAP
- What's really missing is a national tuition policy
- One interesting/good thing in the budget is language authorizing tuition indexing in future years
- Also differential tuition for graduate programs (by sector)
- Lost opportunity: if there had been modest increases over the last seven years there could have been quality improvements made to the university and the institutional benefit of faculty/staff positions, library holdings and facilities improvement would have been considerable
- As people lobby against the tuition increase the risk is if tuition is reduced, without an increase in funding, a hole in the budget will result. If tuition goes down state support must go up

TAP

- The restructuring of TAP has been proposed previously but historically has been shot down
- This year's plan assumes that 1/3 deferred until graduation will be offset by loans if necessary and 1/3, when paid would come with interest
- Is at least a more realistic and less punitive proposal than in the past two years, because it is not tied to unrealistic graduation deadlines
- TAP changes are problematic for students with no borrowing capacity, or to families that are not sophisticated about borrowing
- Will have a serious impact on all but the wealthiest of privates
- Most likely target for legislative restoration

EOP

- The impact on the EOP program is a very serious issue for New Paltz.
- Our EOP program has been recognized as one of the most successful in SUNY
- For many years, the retention and graduation rates for our EOP classes have surpassed those of non-EOP

- Elimination of stipends affects ability to pay for books and some living expenses
- Loss of stipends, compounded by a tuition increase and 1/3 TAP reduction, means that EOP students, by definition the financially neediest, could be subject to the severest impacts of tuition increase/aid reduction
- The grandfather of EOP Arthur O. Eve (Buffalo) retired in December

Capital Budget

- We are in the 6th year of a 5 year budget plan
- Funding for a new five year plan
- Can help us address some of our outstanding needs, possibility of block grants

Barbara Hardgrave commended the committee work on this campus, especially the Middle States, GE3 and Assessment committees

Report of the Assessment Steering Committee:

- Is primarily a means for ensuring continual improvement and an opportunity to validate our strengths
- Is a means for improving student learning and the quality of other aspects of academic and administrative programs
- Is intended to ensure that students are offered the best living/learning environment
- An Assessment system at New Paltz should be designed based on what is right for the campus, but should also meet multiple external demands for accountability
- Assessment is not just focused in the academic areas but support as well
- Assessment does not evaluate individual faculty, staff or courses
- Assessment should be led by the faculty where academic programs are involved
- The campus is engaged in a discussion on assessment
- Will require time and commitment on the part of faculty and staff and should be acknowledged as university service
- The General Education Board, in direct collaboration with faculty, will develop an assessment system for GEIII
- Annual progress on assessment should be reported utilizing our existing annual report process
- The Provost in conjunction with the Deans should specify the process and the common assessment system for each school
- For Administrative and Academic Support Assessment the establishment of a short-term committee that would review plans, provide feedback and assist in the process of Assessment
- The Assessment Advisory Council would assess the assessment process as a whole
- Town Meetings have been arranged to engage in dialogue and to provide feedback:
 - February 20th at 10am, International Programs Conference Room
 - February 28th at 3pm, Teaching and Learning Center
 - March 5th at 5:30pm, College Terrace
- Please feel free to contact Anne Balant or Kelli Parmley if you have any questions or comments regarding assessment

Comments After the Report

- President Poskanzer is impressed with the work done by this committee and the GE Board and likes that we are doing this on our own terms.
- Even without an external influence we should be engaged in assessment, this is wise and consistent with our values

Question: What resources are available?

Answer: Peer coaches/It is hard to talk about what resources you need without assessment

Question: What is the time frame?
Answer: Not everything may be assessed in a year. Annual progress can be reported no matter what stage it is in. Programs will set their own priorities for assessment. The key is to annually report progress. Results will vary across programs; we just want to show progress

Question: Will assessment evaluate individuals, departments and faculty?
Answer: Great care will be taken to how the data is used. Assessment is intended for improvement not evaluation

Meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Felipa Biamonte
Secretary pro tem

* * * * *

Agenda: Academic Senate Meeting
February 7, 2003

1. Reading and approval of minutes. (November 22, 2002)
2. Announcements
3. Report of President of the College
Questions and action items from the floor.
4. Report of the Presiding Officer of the Academic Senate
Questions and action items from the floor.
5. Action items from Academic Senate Officers.
6. Action items from Academic Senate Committees.
Questions and action items from the floor.
7. Unfinished Business.
8. New Business: Report of the Assessment Steering Committee
9. Optional reading of reports of Officers and Committees of the College Faculty.
10. Adjournment

Minutes: SUNY New Paltz Academic Senate
November 22, 2002

Attendance: Jonathan Amoia, Student Representative, Stephen Bradford, Art; Ann C. Balant, Communication Disorders; Peter D. G. Brown, Foreign Languages; Jim Dembowski, Academic Affairs Committee, Alan Dunefsky, Mark Dziuba, Music, Matt Geller, Student Representative; Gail K. Gallerie, President's Office; Mary Hafeli, Art Department; Susan Kraat, Library; Gerald A. Kitzmann, Faculty Senator; Glenn McNitt, Political Science; Steve Poskanzer, Interim President, Nancy Schniedewind, Educational Studies; Frank Trezza, Theatre; June Zuckerman, Secondary Education

1. **Call to order:** Mark Dziuba, acting chair in the absence of Barbara Hardgrave, called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m.
2. **Reading and Approval of the Minutes:** Minutes approved as written.
3. **Report of the President:** Interim President Poskanzer did not have a report but allowed for questions. No questions were asked.

4. **Report of the Presiding Officer:** The Presiding officer was not in attendance so no report was given.
5. **Unfinished Business:** The order of business was changed in order to discuss the motion from the last Academic Senate Meeting regarding student use of selected questions from the SEI.

Discussion: June Zuckerman stated that there were no objections from School of Education for students publishing their own survey that was designed along the needs of students. All of her constituents felt using the SEI would be unacceptable. Some were concerned that this process would exacerbate the burden the instrument puts on junior faculty. The SEI was originally intended to help faculty improve their own teaching. Instead, the SEI has become a high stakes instrument because no positive employment decision can be made without use of the SEI. Additionally, the faculty are guaranteed confidentiality of the SEI. Although other schools may publish the results, at these schools the SEI does not enter in any personnel decision. Thus the School of Education has instructed to her to vote no on this motion.

Nancy Schniedewind from Educational Studies stated that she spoke to her colleagues. Many have concerns about the SEI in that it is not the best way to measure teaching. Many feel that the SEI should be revised. Schneidewind went on to offer suggestions such as putting syllabi on ERes in order to give more information about what the courses are like. Another suggestion would be to revise the part of the SEI where students write comments about the course. Perhaps these comments could be made more specific. Students could read more detail about the comments on the course. Schneidewind suggested a joint student/faculty committee to look into this.

Peter Brown stated that he spoke to members of his department. Did not see a problem as long as it was an optional choice for faculty members.

Jonathan addressed the issue of creating a tool themselves in that they felt that the choices they might make might not be the most ideal for faculty and thus they wanted to use a tool already in place.

(At this point in the discussion, the motion was officially untabled to discuss.)

Jim Dembowksi of the Academic Affairs committee stated that the committee discussed the issue. The committee fell into two camps. The first group of people were generally opposed to the publication of results of the SEI due to the fact that it is perceived as a flawed instrument, and because of the issue of grade inflation and confidentiality. The second group of people were in favor as long as it was voluntary to participate or voluntary to participate in a separate instrument created by the students. The committee failed to come to a consensus and thus they are meeting again on December 3rd at 11:30 a.m. in HAB 802. He encouraged a student representative to come to the next meeting.

Glenn McNitt, President of New Paltz UUP, stated that the union has decided that there is not a direct contractual infringement on this issue, but if the SEI is tied to employment it could be. The union has not heard much faculty input on the issue, so the union has not formed an opinion

Jonathan Amoia, student representative, stated that it seems that the intention of working with the faculty has been lost and if these four questions are not agreeable, then we could change them. The students could have already created a separate evaluation. The whole purpose of this motion was to work together.

Matt Geller, student representative stated that there was a reason why students picked these four questions out of the SEI and feel that we are focusing on the document itself rather than the four questions.

Jonathan Amoia went on to state that if we take these four questions and put them on a different form and distribute them, we would just be creating more work and showing that the faculty would not let us use their form.

Glenn McNitt stated that those four questions do not stand-alone, they are part of a total context.

June Zuckerman reiterated that none of colleagues objected to the particular questions, the substance boiled down that it was an abusive use of the SEI that is already being used for the wrong purposes. She also stated that the faculty were guaranteed confidentiality of the results of the SEI.

Peter Brown asked if it would be acceptable if faculty checked off permission to release the information.

June Zuckerman stated that publication of the results promotes a consumer metaphor for students that demeans what professors do. If someone volunteers, then they give up their right for confidentiality.

President Poskanzer asked Amoia if it would be acceptable to make the process voluntary.

Amoia stated that he would accept a one-year voluntary trial period to see how it works.

Peter Brown made a motion to Amend the motion to state that this will be a one-year voluntary process. The motion was seconded by Nancy Schniedewind.

Discussion: A member of the senate stated that there might be an assumption that a faculty member that chose not to participate was a bad teacher.

Glenn McNitt made a motion to close debate on the amendment. Second by Peter Brown. In favor: 9 Opposed: 7 Amendment passed.

Kristen Rauch asked if the amended motion needed to go back to the Academic Affairs Committee. Glenn McNitt stated that he feels that the Academic Senate could vote on the amendment.

Kristen Rauch also suggested the possibility of using Blackboard so it would be available to students but not the general public

Matt Geller asked if incoming freshman access blackboard? It was stated that you can access blackboard whenever you get your webmail account.

An amendment to the motion was made to have the results be made available to the campus community via Blackboard. The amendment passed.

Nancy Schniedewind stated that she feels that she would like to bring back the amendment of the process being voluntary back to her colleagues. Peter Brown stated that the final decision is not made by us but by the faculty senate and that there would be the time that colleagues can discuss.

The question was called and the senate voted on the following motion (amendments included).

I motion that the Student Evaluation of Instructor statements #s

3. Contributed towards making me a more educated and informed person

- 11. *Stimulated student interest in the subject matter*
- 12. *Treated students with fairness and concern*
- 22. *Overall was an effective instructor*

be made available to the campus community on Blackboard. This will be a one-year voluntary process that will begin the Spring of 2003.

The motion passed with nine in favor, five opposed and one abstention.

Jim Dembowksi stated that the student representatives shouldn't be discouraged due to the fact that they touched a nerve when dealing with this evaluation instrument.

Interim President Poskanzer stated that it is clear from the discussion on this issue that we need to look at the SEI.

6. Report of the Curriculum Committee: David Hobby, chair of the curriculum committee stated that they have been working for the last month to get the guidelines in shape for course approval for the GE III. Hobby passed out an Introduction to the GE III course approval process. The committee has approved most of the guidelines and all of the forms and will have them on the web by Tuesday. Hobby gave a brief overview and stated that all courses will be approved by using objectives. All courses should have clearly articulated objectives. This is why the two parts of the GE, content and competencies, both have objectives.

Gerald Kitzmann asked how objectives would be measured. Hobby replied that this is yet to be determined and is the most difficult part.

7. Unfinished business: None.

8. New Business: Gerald Kitzmann mentioned the SUNY senate website.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

S. Craig Mourton

* * * * *

